

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Status

Claims 1-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5-23, 25-35 and 37-40 are rejected. Claims 4, 24 and 36 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 5-9, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 25-29, 33 and 37-40 are herein amended. Claims 2-4, 23, 24 and 34-36 are herein canceled without prejudice. Claims 41-43 are herein added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the claim amendments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the limitation “the authentication control module” recited therein has insufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 4 is herein canceled.

Claim 1 has been amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the authentication control module” recited in claim 5.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejections are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 9-15, 18, 23, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,754,255 (Sanders).

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have incorporated essentially all the features of claims 2 and 4 into claim 1, to place claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have incorporated essentially all the features of claims 23 and 24 into claim 9, to place claim 9 and the claims which depend therefrom in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 36 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have incorporated essentially all the features of claims 34 and 36 into claim 33, to place claim 33 and the claims which depend therefrom in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 16, 17, 19-22, 25-27, 30, 31, 34, 35 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,870,458 (Caren).

Claims 5-8 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 1 from which they depend.

Claims 16, 17, 19-22, 25-27, 30 and 31 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 9 from which they depend.

Claims 37-40 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 33 from which they depend.

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanders in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,046,161 (Hayes).

Claims 28 and 29 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 9 from which they depend.

New Claims

Claim 41 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons indicated in the Allowable Subject Matter section of this Office Action with regard to claim 24.

Claim 42 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons indicated in the Allowable Subject Matter section of this Office Action with regard to claim 24.

Claim 43 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 42 from which it depends.


Dependent Claims

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicants submit that, for at least similar reasons as to why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, supra, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicants, however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims as herein presented are allowable over the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, and that the respective rejections be withdrawn. Applicants further submit that the application is hereby placed in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Richard D. Ratchford Jr.
Reg. No. 53,865
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Rd.
Woodbury, New York 11797
Tel: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889